



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/558,362	12/21/2005	Ross A. Gresley	INA-16	3814
20311	7590	10/09/2007		
LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP 475 PARK AVENUE SOUTH 15TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10016			EXAMINER CHARLES, MARCUS	
			ART UNIT 3682	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/09/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/558,362

Applicant(s)

GRESLEY, ROSS A.

Examiner

Marcus Charles

Art Unit

3682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 November 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11-25-2005</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This is the first action relating to serial application number 10/558,362 filed 12/25/2005.

Claims 1-7 are currently pending.

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

2. The examiner has accepted the drawing filed with this application as formal drawing.

Specification

Abstract

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: it is not proper to include the legal term "said" in the abstract. In addition, the phrase "according to the invention" is not proper because it is a phrase, which can be implied. The abstract should be written in a single paragraph. Therefore the second paragraph should be deleted. Furthermore, the second paragraph does not describe the invention but adds merit to the invention.
4. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

Art Unit: 3682

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Appropriate correction is required.

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: it is not proper to refer to claims number in the specification. Therefore, the reference to claims numerals should be deleted or replace (for example see page 4).

The brief description on page 5 is not proper. The brief description of the drawings appear to be a shotgun description and do not provide a brief description of each individual description of each drawing in relation to the sectional drawing and as to which drawing belongs to which section. In addition, there are more than one embodiments in the drawing and the brief description fails to provide any brief detail of the difference between the embodiments. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claim 1 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Muntnich et al. (4,971,460). Muntnich et al. discloses a radial/axial bearing (see fig. 1) comprising a radial bearing (1) received in a cylindrical sleeve (3) and having a cylindrical rolling bodies (1) and an axial bearing having cylindrical rolling bodies (4) such that the radial and axial bearings are connected to form a captive structural unit comprising an outer running track (see 15) of the axial bearing is formed by a radially inward-pointing rim (6) of the cylindrical sleeve (3), the rim adjoining an axially outward projecting cylindrical portion (not labeled) of the sleeve (3), while an inner running track (see item 5) of the axial bearing is formed by a radially outward pointing rim (see 5) of the inner ring (2) of the radial bearing; the prolongation of the axes of rotation of the radial bearing (1) intersect the axis of the axial bearing intersects at the center of the cylindrical rolling body (4) of the axial bearing.

In claim 4, note the inward pointing flange (4).

In claims 5-6, note the cages for the axial and radial bearings (see attached drawing).

In claim 7, the method of forming the device is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself. Therefore, this limitation has not been given patentable weight.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muntnich et al. in view of Bauer et al. (5,829,890). Muntnich et al. do not disclose the radial bearing (1) has a smaller ratio of diameter to the length than the rolling bearing (4) of the axial bearing. Bauer et al. disclose a radial/axial bearing having a radial bearing (R) with a smaller ratio diameter to the length than the axial bearing (5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device of Muntnich et al. so that the radial bearings have a smaller ratio of diameter to the length than the axial bearing in view of Bauer et al. in order to reduce actual friction and to reduce the radial size of the bearing thus making the bearing more compact.

Regarding claim 3, Muntnich et al. in view of Bauer et al. fails to disclose the ratio as claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device of Muntnich et al. in view of Bauer et al.

Art Unit: 3682

so as to obtain the ratios as claimed, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim is disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.


Citation

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Note the prior art cited in attached PTO Form 892.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marcus Charles whose telephone number is (571) 272-7101. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ridley Richard can be reached on (571) 272-6917. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


MARCUS CHARLES
PRIMARY EXAMINER

9/30/2007